DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 260 054 SP 026 378

AUTHOR Adams, Ronald D.; Craig, James R.
TITLE National Survey of Evaluation Practices in Teacher Education.
PUB DATE Nov 81
NOTE 17p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Mid-South Educational Research Association (Lexington, KY, November, 1981). For related document, see SP 026 382.
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Information Analyses (070)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Evaluation Methods; *Evaluation Needs; Followup Studies; Graduate Surveys; Higher Education; Preservice Teacher Education; *Program Evaluation; *Teacher Education Programs

ABSTRACT

A survey of teacher education evaluation practices was conducted to cover areas not addressed in previous studies. The initial survey form was reviewed by college administrators at Western Kentucky University, revised, and later reviewed by selected members of a group of professional educators across the nation. A questionnaire, developed to collect data in eight areas of institutional evaluation practices, was sent to member institutions of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. A usable return was obtained from 445 institutions. Findings are reported in seven topical areas: (1) institutional demographics; (2) topics evaluated; (3) needs relative to evaluation practice; (4) value placed on evaluation; (5) sources and techniques used in evaluation practice; (6) planning, operation, and feedback practices; and (7) budget analyses. Implications of the survey are discussed. It is pointed out that while the majority of institutions engage in some form of evaluation, the techniques of follow-up data collection have been limited primarily to the mailed questionnaire and sources limited primarily to the graduate and school supervisor. The sophistication of evaluation practice remains low. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED260054

National Survey of Evaluation Practices in Teacher Education

by Dr. Ronald D. Adams
Dr. James R. Craig
Western Kentucky University

Presented at the 1981 Annual Meeting of the
Mid-South Educational Research Association

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

R Adams

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

Lexington, Kentucky
November, 1981

SP026378

INTRODUCTION

Evaluation of teacher education programs has become an important activity for most institutions of higher education. This is true partly as the result of new teacher education accreditation standards established by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) and the National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification (NASDTEC)--the two organizations most influential in the specific accreditation of teacher education programs, and partly due to the increased need to show accountability in the preparation and continuing education of teachers. NCATE Standard 6.1 (1977) and NASDTEC Standard 3.1 (1976) prescribe evaluation of teacher education programs and, in each case, dictate that evidence of evaluating students while still undergraduates as well as following-up graduates after they have entered the teaching profession are clearly requisites for meeting the standard.

The existing professional literature regarding the practice of evaluation in education poorly represents the state-of-the-art as practiced. For example, Smith (1979) found that ERIC searches were totally inadequate in identifying and representing the education evaluation literature--a fact that was graphically demonstrated by the Katz et. al. (1981) article who reported an erroneous analysis of the "state-of-the-art" in teacher education evaluation based on an ERIC search (Adams, Craig, Hord and Hall, 1981).

The extent of follow-up evaluation of graduates was directly examined by Pegues (1978) who conducted a national survey of teacher education institutions regarding follow-up evaluation practice. In this initial effort to determine the state-of-the-practice in teacher education evaluation, she found fewer than half of the 1000 institutions surveyed reported being engaged in follow-up evaluation of graduates. She further concluded, "There is a minimal level of evaluation sophistication in the design and implementation of contemporary evaluation schema."

While the Pegues study provided base line data regarding teacher education evaluation practice, her perspective was somewhat narrow. For example, pre-service evaluation was not considered--only follow-up. Other important areas not specifically or adequately covered by Pegues were perceived need for assistance by institutions conducting or planning to conduct teacher education program evaluation, values placed on evaluation by faculty and administrators, and budget information. The decision to conduct a survey of teacher education evaluation practice resulted from a need to understand the nature of current evaluation efforts given the lack of reported evaluation programs. A questionnaire was developed that collected data in eight areas:

1. Institutional demographics
2. Topics evaluated
3. Techniques used in evaluation
4. Sources of evaluation data
5. Evaluation periods
6. Needs relative to evaluation practice
7. Value placed on evaluation
8. Resources devoted to evaluation

The initial survey form was reviewed by college administrators at Western Kentucky University, revised, and later reviewed by selected members of Teacher Education Program Follow-Up group (a group of professional educators from across the nation who are interested in teacher education evaluation).

The evaluation forms were mailed about the middle of November 1980. An initial return of 36 percent was received. A follow-up survey was sent to non-responding institutions the second week in January, 1981, resulting in an additional 21 percent for a total return rate of 57 percent. The population for the survey consisted of AACTE member institutions (n=779). A usable return was obtained from 445 institutions.

FINDINGS

Findings will be reported in seven topical areas:

1. Institutional demographics
2. Topics evaluated
3. Needs relative to evaluation practice
4. Value placed on evaluation
5. Sources and techniques used in evaluation practice
6. Planning, operation, and feedback practices
7. Budget analyses

It should be noted that these are selected findings and a more indepth report of the analyses of data should be available in January, 1982.

The findings contained in this paper are descriptive in nature and report the percentages and/or frequencies obtained from the survey data. Occasionally chi square analyses were utilized to study relationships among selected variables.

Institutional demographics

The range in teacher education program size was from 13 to 7,300 with 57.7 percent below 500 enrollment. Public supported institutions comprised 54.0 percent of the sample with 46.0 percent privately supported. The overwhelming majority of the institutions were AACTE members, not surprising since the mailing list was obtained from AACTE member institutions. Approximately 2/3 of the institutions were NCATE accredited.

The length of follow-up evaluation practice suggested that institutions were engaged in follow-up of graduates with 73.5 percent reporting some type of graduate follow-up. Table 1 presents these summary statistics.

TABLE 1

Total Sample Follow-Up Evaluation Practice

	No Evaluation	Preservice Only	Follow-Up (Years) 1st yr.	2-3 yr.	4+ yr.	Total
frequency	64	54	96	109	122	445
percent	14.4	12.1	21.6	24.5	27.4	100.0

Further breakdown of these analyses suggested that more public supported than private supported institutions reported conducting no evaluation practice. It was also interesting to note that 72 NCATE accredited institutions reported no or preservice only evaluation, thus, not meeting current NCATE standards for evaluation. Table 2 reports summary data for type of support, AACTE membership and NCATE accreditation.

TABLE 2

Evaluation Practice By Type of Support, AACTE Membership, and NCATE Accreditation

Evaluation Practice		Type of Support: Public	Private	AACTE Member: Yes	No	NCATE Accredited: Yes	No
No Evaluation	f	41	23	48	16	38	26
	%	64.1	35.9	75.0	25.0	59.4	40.6
Preservice Only	f	31	23	48	6	34	20
	%	57.4	42.6	88.9	11.1	63.0	37.0
Follow-Up	f	167	160	279	48	215	112
	%	51.1	48.9	85.3	14.7	65.7	34.3
Total	f	239	206	375	70	287	158
	%	54.0	46.0	84.3	15.7	64.5	35.5

Topics Evaluated

For institutions reporting evaluation practice, the survey form provided seven choices for types of evaluation data collected. The three items most often checked were "teacher skills, strategies, and techniques", "knowledge of subject matter", and "relationships with students." Table 3 presents these summary data.

TABLE 3

Percentage of Responses to Types of Evaluation Data Collected

Item	Percent
Teacher skills, strategies and techniques	95.8
Knowledge of subject matter	92.9
Relationships with students	88.2
Relationships with peers/colleagues	71.9
Pupil achievements (learning outcomes)	42.0
Participation in professional organizations	39.9
Relationships with parents	39.4
Other	18.6

There appeared to be no relationship between types of data collected and length of follow-up of graduates or technique used to collect data as determined via chi square analysis.

Needs Relative to Evaluation Practice

All institutions were asked to respond to a list of evaluation needs. There were ten areas of assistance provided for those institutions planning, but not engaged in, teacher education evaluation and the same ten items for institutions who were presently conducting evaluation of their teacher education program. Table 4 presents these findings.

TABLE 4

Percent of Responses to Evaluation Needs By Evaluation Group and No Evaluation Group

Item	Evaluation Group	No Evaluation Group
Defining the evaluation needs	21.0	20.3
Planning an evaluation system	23.1	40.6*
Initiating an evaluation system	11.0	21.9
Identifying instrumentation	35.2*	32.8*
Developing instrumentation	41.7*	39.1*
Identifying appropriate data analysis	26.5	20.3
Conducting data analyses	23.6	12.5
Interpreting the evaluation data analysis	20.7	12.5
Planning and implementing a feedback system	46.5*	26.6
Utilizing data for program improvement	45.7*	23.4
Other	14.4	7.8

The most frequently reported needs for the evaluation group were in the feedback and utilization of evaluation data. The no evaluation group reported planning an evaluation system most often, while both groups indicated developing and identifying instrumentation as need areas.

Value Placed on Evaluation

Respondents were asked to give their perceived value placed on evaluation for faculty and administrators at their institution. A 1 to 5 rating scale was utilized with 1 indicating little value and 5 great value. Table 5 contains the responses to these questions.

TABLE 5

Responses to the Perceived Value Placed on Evaluation of Faculty and Administrators

	Evaluation Group						No Evaluation Group					
	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	1	2	3	4	5	Mean
Administration	0.6	4.7	17.2	39.2	38.3	4.10	1.7	13.6	30.5	45.8	8.5	3.45
Faculty	0.3	5.0	22.6	39.2	32.9	3.99	5.2	10.3	36.2	41.4	6.9	3.34

There appeared to be no differences between administrators and faculty for perceived value of evaluation, however, institutions conducting evaluation reported valuing evaluation practice more than institutions not conducting evaluation.

Chi square analysis was utilized to determine if a relationship existed between perceived value of evaluation by administrators and faculty and extensiveness (length) of follow-up of graduates. A significant chi square was obtained for administrator perceived value and extensiveness of follow-up indicating that institutions with more extensive follow-up also have administrators who value evaluation more. However, the chi square analyses did not produce a significant relationship for faculty perceived value of evaluation and extensiveness of follow-up. It should be noted that for the most part the respondents were administrators and the responses reflect primarily an administrative point of view. Tables 6 and 7 contain the summary and chi square analyses.

TABLE 6

Percent of Responses for Administrator Perceived Value of Evaluation and Extensiveness of Follow-Up

Extensiveness of Follow-Up	Perceived Value				
	1	2	3	4	5
Preservice only	0	0	28.6	35.7	35.7
First Year	2.3	8.0	21.6	38.6	29.5
Two - Three years	0	2.0	12.1	39.4	46.5
Four - Six years	0	7.5	14.0	44.1	34.4
Seven + years	0	0	13.3	20.0	66.7

$X^2 = 28.85$, $P = .0263$

TABLE 7

Percent Responses for Faculty Perceived Value of Evaluation and Extensiveness of Follow-Up

Extensiveness of Follow-Up	Perceived Value 1	2	3	4	5
Preservice only	0	9.5	16.7	33.3	40.5
First year	1.1	5.7	26.1	43.2	23.9
Two - Three years	0	4.0	24.2	40.4	31.3
Four - Six years	0	4.3	20.4	41.9	33.3
Seven + years	0	0	20.0	6.7	73.3

$X^2 = 22.561$, $P = .1286$

Sources and Techniques Used in Evaluation Practice

A major purpose of the survey was to determine the state-of-the-practice in teacher education evaluation. Institutions were asked to indicate the technique used to collect data, the source of the data, and length of follow-up of graduates. Data were collected for three preservice evaluation periods: entry, during, and exit and six inservice or follow-up evaluation periods: first, second, third, four to six, seven to ten, and eleven plus. Data were also collected for four techniques: questionnaires, interview, classroom observation, and standardized tests. Sources of data included the student/graduate, supervisor, peer teachers, pupils and parents.

For this paper, only those techniques and sources that had a reasonably high frequency of response will be reported. Table 8 contains the percentages of response by technique, source and evaluation period.

TABLE 8

Percent of Response by Technique, Source and Evaluation Period

	Preservice			Follow-Up (Years)					
	Entry	During	Exit	1st	2nd	3rd	4-6	7-10	11+
Questionnaires									
Student/Graduate	34.9	48.3	64.7	53.8	20.5	27.0	27.0	3.1	3.1
Supervisor	16.3	42.0	44.9	44.6	14.2	19.7	18.1	1.8	1.0
Interview									
Student/Graduate	26.8	31.8	26.2	9.2	2.9	2.6	5.0	0.5	0.8
Supervisor	11.3	28.3	24.9	9.7	3.1	3.1	4.5	0.5	0.8
Classroom Obv.									
Student/Graduate	16.3	66.7	39.9	10.0	3.1	3.1	3.1	0.8	0.5
Standardized Tests									
Student/Graduate	14.4	8.4	23.9	2.4	1.6	1.8	0.8	0.0	0.0

The most often reported technique and source of data collection for preservice evaluation was classroom observation during the undergraduate teacher education program followed closely by questionnaires at exit from the teacher education program. The mailed questionnaire was by far the most utilized technique in follow-up evaluation and the student/graduate and supervisor the most often source of data. Follow-up of graduates and supervisors of graduates remained fairly substantial through years four to six.

Planning, Operation and Feedback Practices

Institutions conducting evaluation were asked to rate various aspects of planning, operation, and feedback utilized in their evaluation program on a 1 to 5 scale. From the responses to these questions means and standard deviations were computed to determine relative perceptions in these areas. Faculty were reported as having the highest degree of participation in the evaluation process through planning, implementation, operation and feedback. Students/graduates were perceived as less frequently involved and having the lowest degree of participation, even less than public school personnel.

The predominant forms of evaluation feedback were written reports and prepared tables. The e forms were perceived as more effective than computer printouts or oral reports. Tables 9 and 10 present the mean ratings for these items.

TABLE 9

Mean Ratings for Degree of Participation in Evaluation Process

	Type of Participation Ratings							
	Planning		Implementation		Operation		Dissemination	
Participant	$\bar{X}$	S	$\bar{X}$	S	$\bar{X}$	S	$\bar{X}$	S
Student/Graduate	2.33	1.19	2.73	1.34	3.09	1.40	2.36	1.28
College Faculty	4.28	1.04	4.12	1.19	4.07	1.25	3.94	1.28
College Administrators	3.35	1.41	3.46	1.38	3.45	1.38	3.72	1.38
Public School Personnel	2.75	1.27	3.26	1.35	3.56	1.33	2.74	1.30

Table 10

Mean Ratings of Effectiveness of Feedback Forms

	Type of Feedback Form							
	Computer Printouts		Prepared Tables		Written Reports		Oral Reports	
Evaluation Recipient	$\bar{X}$	S	$\bar{X}$	S	$\bar{X}$	S	$\bar{X}$	S
Student/Graduate	2.60	1.46	2.62	1.30	3.39	1.30	3.15	1.40
College Faculty	3.23	1.22	3.70	1.06	3.91	1.08	3.50	1.23
College Administrator	3.44	1.39	3.76	1.11	3.74	1.16	3.29	1.27
Local Schools	2.45	1.40	2.84	1.33	3.25	1.29	3.00	1.38

Additional analyses of these data suggested that institutions reporting longer term follow-up evaluation had significantly greater involvement in the evaluation process by administrators and faculty. In addition, these institutions reported greater use of computer printouts, written reports, and prepared tables by administrators and faculty.

Budget Analyses

Only 42 percent (n=160) of the institutions conducting evaluation reported budget information. Institutions reporting evaluation budget information were most often those most involved in evaluation practice. Table 11 presents the budget information obtained from the 160 reporting institutions.

TABLE 11

Budget Information for Institutions Conducting Evaluation

	Amount of Budget in Dollars			
	1 - 250	251 - 1250	1251 - 9000	9000 & Over
frequency	37	44	49	30
percent	23.1	27.5	30.6	18.8

Chi square analyses of budget category and length of follow-up evaluation produced no significant relationship.

In addition to reporting budget amount, 70.9 percent reported budgets from internal funds, 10.2 percent reported budgets from external public funds, and 1.3 percent reported funds from external private funds. The duration of funding most often reported was "recurrent" (70.8 percent) with one year or less the next most often funding period (23.1 percent).

IMPLICATIONS

The results of this survey have several implications for teacher education. First, the state-of-the-practice in teacher education evaluation indicates that 85 percent of the institutions responding to this questionnaire have engaged in some form of evaluation and nearly 3/4 were conducting follow-up evaluation of graduates. However, the techniques of follow-up data collection have been limited primarily to the mailed questionnaire and sources primarily to the graduate and supervisor. Thus, the sophistication of evaluation practice remains low, supporting the finding of Pegues (1978).

While the mailed questionnaire is the most often used technique and the graduate and supervisor the most often selected source, Gupser (1981) suggests these are the least desirable ways of collecting evaluation data. He states:

> Surveys must measure what they can, not what may actually be true. The result is that graduates are asked to respond to mundane and nebulous questions: "What did you feel was the most important aspect of your training program?" What did you feel you missed in your preparation program?" Answers to such questions are predictable and less than helpful....Surveys tell us more about peer knowledge and group methodology than they do about preparation programs completed by prospective educators.

Gupser goes on to say that employer surveys are also a poor source of evaluation data. He states:

> Surveys of employers have also proved less than helpful... Perhaps to be critical would be to criticize their own selection and employment procedures. Some may actually fear legal reprisals from criticized employees.

It would seem that while evaluation practice is common, there needs to be some direction (e.g., the development of viable evaluation models) that would allow institutions preparing teachers to more adequately and accurately assess their program efforts. From the summary information on value placed on evaluation, both faculty and administrators appear to value evaluation data. Thus, it is logical to assume that "know how" and resources are the major reasons for poor evaluation practice.

A second implication is related to the perceived needs of institutions conducting evaluation. The most frequent needs of institutions conducting evaluation were identified as being feedback and utilization of evaluation with instrument identification and development second. Planning the evaluation system and instrumentation were most frequently cited as needs for institutions not currently involved in evaluation. From these findings the question of "know how" as a barrier to more sophisticated evaluation practice would be supported. That is, if institutions had quality instrumentation, a planned system for collecting the data, and an effective data feedback and utilization procedure, the result would be higher quality evaluation of teacher education programs.

A third implication centers on resources. Half of the institutions reported spending $1250 with nearly half of these reporting spending less than $250 on evaluation. Approximately 30 percent of the institutions spend between $1251 and $9000, certainly modest in relation to most teacher education budgets. On this issue Gubser (1981) states:

> Evaluation efforts often fail because they are insufficiently financed. The adage that one gets what one pays for could be no more true than in reference to the assessment of graduates...The last place one wants to become stingy is in the area of evaluation. If done appropriately, evaluation can actually save money by making programs more cost effective, to say nothing of improving general academic quality.

Obviously, evaluation efforts must be financed to the extent they can become an adequate source of information which can assist in meaningful program change. Any less would be folly and perceived as whitewash applied only to satisfy ulterior motives.

As a beginning to address the problems identified for teacher education evaluation, an informal group has been established since 1978 called the Teacher Education Program Follow-Up (TEPFU) study group. Through the efforts

of this group a newsletter, published by the R&D Center for Teacher Education, The University of Texas at Austin, is attempting to disseminate information about teacher education evaluation. The Office of Educational Research at Western Kentucky University is undertaking a project to provide a repository of evaluation program descriptions, instrumentation, findings, and financing to be available to participating institutions. Other needed activities would appear to be the development of evaluation models, training and technical assistance seminars, and a formal association structure to promote and assist institutions in the evaluation process.

In a time when teacher education programs are under the most severe attack in history, the need to conduct program evaluations to verify our worthiness in professional practice and in improvement of that practice is indeed a critical one.

REFERENCES

Adams, Craig, Hord and Hall. "Program Evaluation in Teacher Education: A Response to Katz et. al. (1981). To be published in the Journal of Teacher Education, September-October issue, 1981.

Gubser, Lyn. "What Not to Do in Evaluating Teacher Education Programs: A Dozen Don'ts", Teacher Education Program Evaluation, 1981: Theory and Practice, Hord and Adams, editors. Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, The University of Texas at Austin, 1981.

Katz, et. al., "Follow-Up Studies: Are They Worth the Trouble", Journal of Teacher Education, Vol. XXXII, Number 2, March-April 1981.

Pegues, Wennette W. An Assessment of Teacher Education Evaluation Follow-Up Evaluation in the United States: A Descriptive Analysis, Doctoral Dissertation, The University of Tulsa, Tulsa, Oklahoma 1978.

Smith, N. L. "The Limitations of ERIC in Reviewing Evaluation Literature", Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 1979, 1 (1), 68-73.

Standards for Accreditation of Teacher Education, The National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education, Washington, D.C., 1977.

WESTERN KENTUCKY UNIVERSITY
The cost of printing this publication by Western Kentucky University was paid from state funds KRS 57.375.